UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

m N

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,701	09/30/2004	Patrick R. Guido	014682.000013	5700

44870   7590   05/17/2007
MOORE & VAN ALLEN, PLLC For IBM
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER
ALI, OMAR R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2109	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

The following action is in response to the original filing of September 30, 2004. Claims

1-48 are pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

2.   Claims 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 44-48 are drawn to a computer readable medium, which the applicant has

defined in the specification (page 14, paragraph 42) to encompass an electronic

transmission signal. The Office considers an electronic signal to be a form of energy.

Energy is not a series of steps or acts and this is not a process. Energy is not a

physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a

combination of substances and therefore not a compilation of matter. Thus, an

electronic transmission signal does not fall within any of the four categories of invention.

Therefore, Claims 44-48 are not statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1,15-17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27-29, 36-38, and 44 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chowdhry et al. (US 2003/0167315).

Claims 1 and 44: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet,

comprising:

        a. deactivating a selected portlet in response to operating a deactivation feature

[minimizing] (page 15, paragraph 270);

        b. reactivating the selected portlet in response to operating a reactivation feature

[restoring] (page 15, paragraph 271).

Claim 15: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet, comprising:

        a. preserving, freezing or caching data or information in a selected portlet (page

14, paragraph 246);

        b. changing a behavior of the portlet on the portal page (page 5, paragraph 106).

Claim 16: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 15

above, further comprising:

a. preventing the portlet from being affected by refreshes across the portal page

(page 14, paragraph 243).

Claim 17: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 15

above, further comprising:

a. selectively toggling the portlet to change the portlet's ability to be targeted by a

portal click-to-action feature (page 15, paragraph 270).

Claims 19 and 23: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet,

comprising:

a. a plurality of portlets (page 15, paragraph 267);

b. a deactivation feature [minimize] associated with at least one of the plurality of

portlets to deactivate the portlet to preserve a selected content of the at least one portlet

(page 15, paragraph 270).

Claims 20 and 24: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in

Claims 19 and 23 above, further comprising:

a. the at least one portlet comprises a reactivation feature formed in response to

the at least one portlet being deactivated (page 15, paragraph 271).

Claims 27 and 38: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet,

comprising:

a. a portal server (page 4, paragraph 94);

b. a portlet deactivation/reactivation feature operable on the portal server (page 15, paragraphs 270-271).

Claim 28: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 27 above, further comprising:

a. the portlet deactivation/reactivation feature comprises means to deactivate a selected portlet in response to operating a deactivation feature (page 15, paragraph 270).

Claim 29: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 27 above, further comprising:

a. the portlet deactivation/reactivation feature comprises means to reactivate a deactivated portlet in response to operating a reactivation feature (page 15, paragraph 271).

Claim 36: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 27 above, further comprising:

a. means for preventing the portlet from being affected by refreshes across the portal page (page 14, paragraph 243).

Claim 37: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 27

above, further comprising:

a. means for selectively toggling the portlet to change the portlet's ability to be

targeted by a portal click-to-action feature (page 15, paragraph 270).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 2-9, 18, 22, 26, 30-35, 39-43, and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry et al. (US 2003/0167315).

Claims 2 and 45: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in

Claims 1 and 44 above, but does not explicitly disclose freezing a portlet content in the

selected portlet in response to deactivating the selected portlet. However, Chowdhry

does disclose minimizing a portlet by selecting a minimizing feature, which would in turn

freeze the contents by eliminating user interactions with the minimized portlet (page 15,

paragraph 270). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made at the time the invention was made to freeze

the portlet content in response to deactivating the selected portlet. One would have

been motivated to freeze the contents of the deactivated portlet to prevent unwanted changes to occur while the portlet is deactivated.

Claims 3 and 46: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claims 1 and 44 above, but does not explicitly disclose disabling hyperlinks, buttons and other inputs to the selected portlet in response to deactivating the selected portlet. However, Chowdhry does disclose minimizing a portlet by selecting a minimizing feature, which eliminates user interactions with the body of the portlet (page 15, paragraph 269). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disable hyperlinks and other inputs in response to deactivating the selected portlet. One would have been motivated to disable the inputs to the selected portlet in order to prevent the user from selecting functions that aren't desired at the time.

Claims 4 and 47: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claims 1 and 44 above, but does not explicitly disclose reconfiguring a portal server associated with the portal page to ensure that a portlet content of the selected portlet cannot be affected while the selected portlet is deactivated. However, Chowdhry does disclose a portal cache server, which stores the contents of refreshed portals, and the option to minimize a portlet by selecting a minimizing feature (page 5, paragraph 109). Since minimizing the portlet would disable user interaction with the contents of the portlet, the caching server would only receive updates from the portals that are active.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to reconfigure the portal server to ensure that a portlet content

of the selected portlet cannot be affected while the selected portlet is deactivated. One

would have been motivated to reconfigure the server to ensure that portlet content

cannot be affected while the selected portlet is deactivated to prevent any undesired

changes from occurring to the deactivated portlet.

Claim 5: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 1

above, but does not explicitly disclose detecting a deactivated state of the selected

portlet. However, Chowdhry does disclose minimizing a portlet by selecting a

minimizing feature, and restoring a portlet by selecting a restore feature (page 15,

paragraph 269). In order to allow the user to restore the portlet to its original active

state, the server in Chowdhry would detect the deactivated or minimized state first.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to detect a deactivated state of the selected portlet. One would

have been motivated to detect a deactivated state of the selected portlet in order to

allow the user the option to reactivate the portlet.

Claim 6: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 1

above, but does not explicitly disclose replacing a content of the selected portlet with a

frozen content in response to a portal server detecting a deactivated state of the

selected portlet. However, Chowdhry does disclose minimizing a portlet by selecting a

minimizing feature, which would in turn freeze the contents by eliminating user interactions with the minimized portlet (page 15, paragraph 270). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made at the time the invention was made to freeze the portlet content in response to deactivating the selected portlet. One would have been motivated to freeze the contents of the deactivated portlet to prevent unwanted changes to occur while the portlet is deactivated.

Claim 7: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose enabling hyperlinks, buttons and other inputs to the selected portlet in response to reactivating the selected portlet. However, Chowdhry does disclose restoring a portlet by selecting a restoring feature, which allows user interactions with the body of the portlet (page 15, paragraph 269). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable hyperlinks and other inputs in response to reactivating the selected portlet. One would have been motivated to enable the inputs to the selected portlet in order to restore user interaction with the portlet.

Claim 8: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose permitting a content of the selected portlet to be updated in response to reactivating the selected portlet. However, Chowdhry does disclose a restore option to restore a minimized [deactivated] portlet, and the option to

manually refresh the selected portlet (page 14, paragraph 274). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to permit a content of the selected portlet to be updated in response to

reactivating the selected portlet. One would have been motivated to permit content of a

reactivated portlet to be updated in order to present the most recent version of the

portlet to the user.

Claim 9: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 1

above, but does not explicitly disclose launching a new portlet similar to the deactivated,

selected portlet in response to a portal server receiving a request that calls for use of

the deactivated selected portlet if the deactivated selected portlet is a singleton portlet.

However, Chowdhry does disclose the option to recreate a portlet with similar

parameters to the original selected portlet (page 12-13, paragraph 225). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to launch a new portlet similar to the deactivated, selected portlet. One

would have been motivated to launch a new portlet similar to the selected, deactivated

portlet in order to edit a new instance of the deactivated portlet.

Claim 18: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 1

above, but does not explicitly disclose selectively ignoring a presence of a singleton

portlet. However, Chowdhry does disclose minimizing a portlet by selecting a

minimizing feature and the option to interact with a plurality of portlets (page 15,

paragraphs 267 and 270). By minimizing a portlet, the user is selectively ignoring the

instance of a portlet, and is able to interact with other portlets. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to selectively ignore a presence of a singleton portlet. One would have been motivated

to selectively ignore the presence of a singleton portlet in order to interact with other

portlets without constraints.

Chowdhry also does not explicitly disclose creating a new instance of the

singleton portlet being needed to perform a task. However, Chowdhry does disclose

the option to recreate a portlet with similar parameters to the original selected portlet

(page 12-13, paragraph 225). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create a new instance of

the singleton portlet in response to the singleton portlet being needed to perform a task.

One would have been motivated to create a new instance of the singleton portlet in

order to allow the user to dynamically edit the portlets.

Claims 22 and 26: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in

Claims 19 and 23 above, but does not explicitly disclose another portlet similar to the at

least one portlet being launched in response to a request that calls for use of the at

least one portlet, if the at least one portlet is deactivated and a singleton portlet.

However, Chowdhry does disclose the option to recreate a portlet with similar

parameters to the original selected portlet (page 12-13, paragraph 225). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to launch a new portlet in response to a request that calls for use of the at

least one portlet. One would have been motivated to create a new instance of the

singleton portlet in order to allow the user to dynamically edit the portlets.

Claims 30 and 39: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in

Claims 27 and 38 above, but does not explicitly disclose the portlet

deactivation/reactivation feature comprises means for freezing a portlet content in a

selected portlet in response to deactivating the selected portlet. However, Chowdhry

does disclose minimizing a portlet by selecting a minimizing feature, which would in turn

freeze the contents by eliminating user interactions with the minimized portlet (page 15,

paragraph 270). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made at the time the invention was made to freeze

the portlet content in response to deactivating the selected portlet. One would have

been motivated to freeze the contents of the deactivated portlet to prevent unwanted

changes to occur while the portlet is deactivated.

Claims 31 and 40: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in

Claims 27 and 38 above, but does not explicitly disclose the portlet

deactivation/reactivation feature comprises means for disabling hyperlinks, buttons and

other inputs to the selected portlet in response to deactivating the selected portlet.

However, Chowdhry does disclose minimizing a portlet by selecting a minimizing

feature, which eliminates user interactions with the body of the portlet (page 15,

paragraph 269). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disable hyperlinks and other inputs in response to deactivating the selected portlet. One would have been motivated to disable the inputs to the selected portlet in order to prevent the user from selecting functions that aren't desired at the time.

Claims 32 and 41: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claims 27 and 38 above, but does not explicitly disclose the portlet deactivation/reactivation feature comprises means to reconfigure the portal server to ensure that a portlet content of a selected portlet cannot be affected while the selected portlet is deactivated. However, Chowdhry does disclose a portal cache server, which stores the contents of refreshed portals, and the option to minimize a portlet by selecting a minimizing feature (page 5, paragraph 109). Since minimizing the portlet would disable user interaction with the contents of the portlet, the caching server would only receive updates from the portals that are active. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to reconfigure the portal server to ensure that a portlet content of the selected portlet cannot be affected while the selected portlet is deactivated. One would have been motivated to reconfigure the server to ensure that portlet content cannot be affected while the selected portlet is deactivated to prevent any undesired changes from occurring to the deactivated portlet.

Claim 33: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 27

above, but does not explicitly disclose the portlet deactivation/reactivation feature

comprises means for detecting a deactivated state of the selected portlet. However,

Chowdhry does disclose minimizing a portlet by selecting a minimizing feature, and

restoring a portlet by selecting a restore feature (page 15, paragraph 269). In order to

allow the user to restore the portlet to its original active state, the server in Chowdhry

would detect the deactivated or minimized state first. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

detect a deactivated state of the selected portlet. One would have been motivated to

detect a deactivated state of the selected portlet in order to allow the user the option to

reactivate the portlet.

Claims 34 and 42: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in

Claims 27 and 38 above, but does not explicitly disclose the portlet

deactivation/reactivation feature comprises means for replacing a content of the

selected portlet with a frozen content in response to the portal server detecting a

deactivated state of the selected portlet. However, Chowdhry does disclose minimizing

a portlet by selecting a minimizing feature, which would in turn freeze the contents by

eliminating user interactions with the minimized portlet (page 15, paragraph 270).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made at the time the invention was made to freeze the portlet content

in response to deactivating the selected portlet. One would have been motivated to

freeze the contents of the deactivated portlet to prevent unwanted changes to occur while the portlet is deactivated.

Claims 35 and 43: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet as in Claims 27 and 38 above, but does not explicitly disclose the portlet deactivation/reactivation feature comprises means for launching a new portlet similar to a deactivated, selected portlet in response to the portal server receiving a request that calls for use of the deactivated selected portlet if the deactivated selected portlet is a singleton. However, Chowdhry does disclose the option to recreate a portlet with similar parameters to the original selected portlet (page 12-13, paragraph 225). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to launch a new portlet similar to the deactivated, selected portlet. One would have been motivated to launch a new portlet similar to the selected, deactivated portlet in order to edit a new instance of the deactivated portlet.

5.   Claims 10-14, 21, 25, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry et al. (US 2003/0167315) in view of Stewart et al. (US 2002/0152110).

Claim 10: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet, comprising:

        a. deactivating a selected portlet in response to operating a deactivation feature [minimizing] (page 15, paragraph 270);

b. reactivating the selected portlet in response to operating a reactivation feature [restoring] (page 15, paragraph 271).

Chowdhry does not explicitly disclose overlaying the selected portlet with an electronic pane or window to block all inputs of the selected portlet while the selected portlet is deactivated. Stewart discloses a similar method and system to control operation of a portlet, that further discloses overlaying a layer over a web page that is loading a graphic (page 4, paragraph 51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to overlay the selected portlet with an electric pane or window to block all inputs of the selected portlet in Chowdhry. One would have been motivated to overlay the deactivated portlet with a pane or window in order to prevent a user from entering commands while the portlet is deactivated.

Claim 11: Chowdhry and Stewart disclose a method to control operation of portlet as in Claim 10 above. Though neither reference explicitly discloses automatically replacing a content of the selected portlet with a frozen content in response to a portal server detecting a deactivated state of the selected portlet, Chowdhry does disclose minimizing a portlet by selecting a minimizing feature, which would in turn freeze the contents by eliminating user interactions with the minimized portlet (page 15, paragraph 270). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made at the time the invention was made to freeze the portlet content in response to deactivating the selected portlet. One would have been motivated to

freeze the contents of the deactivated portlet to prevent unwanted changes to occur

while the portlet is deactivated.

Claim 12: Chowdhry and Stewart disclose a method to control operation of portlet as in

Claim 10 above, and Stewart further discloses removing the overlaying layer after

graphics on the underlying page have finished loading (page 4, paragraph 51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to remove the overlaying pane in response to a portal server

detecting a reactivated state of the selected portlet in Chowdhry. One would have been

motivated to overlay the deactivated portlet with a pane or window in order to prevent a

user from entering commands while the portlet is deactivated.

Claim 13: Chowdhry and Stewart disclose a method to control operation of portlet as in

Claim 10 above. Though neither reference explicitly discloses automatically replacing a

frozen content of the selected portlet with any updated content in response to

reactivating the selected portlet, Chowdhry does disclose a restore option to restore a

minimized [deactivated] portlet, and the option to manually or automatically refresh the

selected portlet (page 14, paragraph 243/page 15, paragraph 271/page 15, paragraph

274). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to permit a content of the selected portlet to be updated in

response to reactivating the selected portlet. One would have been motivated to permit

content of a reactivated portlet to be updated in order to present the most recent version

of the portlet to the user.

Claim 14: Chowdhry and Stewart disclose a method to control operation of portlet as in

Claim 10 above. Though neither reference explicitly discloses launching a new portlet

similar to the deactivated, selected portlet in response to a portal server receiving a

request that calls for use of the deactivated selected portlet if the deactivated selected

portlet is a singleton, Chowdhry does disclose the option to recreate a portlet with

similar parameters to the original selected portlet (page 12-13, paragraph 225).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to launch a new portlet similar to the deactivated, selected

portlet. One would have been motivated to launch a new portlet similar to the selected,

deactivated portlet in order to edit a new instance of the deactivated portlet.

Claims 21, 25, and 48: Chowdhry discloses a method to control operation of portlet, but

does not explicitly disclose an electronic pane of window or window overlaying the at

least one portlet to block all inputs of the at least one portlet while the at least one

portlet is deactivated. Stewart discloses a similar method and system to control

operation of a portlet, that further discloses overlaying a layer over a web page that is

loading a graphic (page 4, paragraph 51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to overlay the selected

portlet with an electric pane or window to block all inputs of the selected portlet in

Chowdhry. One would have been motivated to overlay the deactivated portlet with a

pane or window in order to prevent a user from entering commands while the portlet is

deactivated.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Omar Abdul-Ali whose telephone number is 571-270-

1694. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri(Alternate Fridays Off) 7:30 -

5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, James Myhre can be reached on 571-270-1065. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OAA
05/11/2007

James W. Myhre
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Lab-5